

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached two drawing sheet include changes to Figures 1 and 2. These two drawing sheets replace the original drawing sheets that included Figures 1 and 2.

In Figure 1, the label "(Conventional Art)" has been inserted near and underneath the label "FIG. 1".

In Figure 2, the label "(Conventional Art)" has been inserted near and underneath the label "FIG. 2".

Attachment: 2 Replacement Drawing Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are rejected while Claims 19 and 20 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting that Claims 19 and 20 are allowable. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Applicant believes that the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

Drawings

The present Office Action states on page 2, paragraph 1: "Figures 1 &2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application." Applicant has herein amended Figures 1 and 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests removal of this drawing objection.

The present Office Action states on page 2, paragraph 3: "The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the 'port clocks' and 'core clock' as shown in claims 1, 3, 4, 11 and 19 must be shown in the drawing or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)." Applicant has herein amended Claims 1, 3, 4, 11 and 19. As such, Applicant respectfully requests removal of this drawing objection.

Non-Statutory Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1, 12 and 18 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 17 18 and 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,955 B1. Applicant has attached a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting rejection, thereby rendering the rejection of Claims 1, 12 and 18 moot. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 12 and 18 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 2-11 and 13-18 depend from allowable independent Claims 1 and 12. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-11 and 13-18 are thus in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. Applicant has herein amended Claims 1 and 14. As such, Applicant respectfully requests removal of this rejection.

Allowable Claims

The present Office Action states on page 5, paragraph 1: "Claims 19, 20 are allowed." Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting the allowance of Claims 19 and 20.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending Claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and that action is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any required fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: Oct. 31, 2007



Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069